Remarks

In the Office action, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by German Patent No. DE 40 05 399 to Jürgenhake ("Jürgenhake") and claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jürgenhake in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,800,050 to Hahn et al. ("Hahn et al.").

In this amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-15 remain pending in the application with claims 6-15 having been withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of objections and rejections in view of the amendments and following remarks.

A. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jürgenhake.

Jürgenhake describes a method for ensuring connection of crimped tags by comparing the electrical connection with a predetermined value. According to Jürgenhake, the height of a crimped collar part can be measured to detect a defective pressing. The height of the part and the pressure exerted by a pressure bar 5 are fed into an evaluating unit 9. The mean value of the criteria is derived automatically by means of transducers, and the mean value is used as a start value for permissible tolerances for the next batch. See Abstract.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for assuring a quality of a crimp joint on a crimping device. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the step of performing a crimping operation using the crimping device and specifying that the continuous measuring and the effecting of the readjustment of the crimp height are performed during the crimping operation. The method includes the steps of:

> performing a crimping operation using the crimping device so as to form a plurality of crimp joints;
>
> continuously measuring an actual value of a crimp parameter of the crimp joints during the crimping operation based on a respective setpoint value of the crimp parameter within a defined upper and lower tolerance value; and
>
> effecting a readjustment of a crimp height during the crimping operation after the actual value reaches a correction value of the crimp parameter.

Applicants respectfully submit that Jürgenhake does not describe, or even suggest, at

least the features of both measuring an actual value of a crimp parameter and effecting a readjustment of the crimp height during the crimping operation. On the contrary, as best understood, Jürgenhake describes a method of determining permissible tolerances for batches of crimp joints using a measurement of the height of the crimp joint to detect a defective joint. Jürgenhake teaches calculating a mean value of the measured height values of a batch of crimp joints, not for performing a readjustment of the machine, but rather for determining a permissible tolerance range for the next batch. As best understood, Fig. 4 shows batches of crimp joints n1 to n12. For each batch, a permissible tolerance range TB2 is calculated based upon a mean of actual measured heights calculated from the previous batch. As best understood, Jürgenhake does not describe or suggest performing a readjustment of the crimp height during the crimping operation, but instead, shutting off the print machine as soon as a crimp joint falls outside the tolerance range TB1, as is described in the case of batch n12 shown in Fig. 4.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jürgenhake in view of Hahn et al.

Hahn et al. describes an adaptive control process for foaming and fusing plastics.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Jürgenhake nor Hahn et al. teach or suggest the features of both measuring and effecting a readjustment of the crimp height during the crimping operation. As already discussed above, Jürgenhake does not suggest this feature, but is instead concerned with caculating permissible tolerance ranges for a batch of crimp joints based on measured height values from a previous batch. Applicants furthermore submit that Hahn et al. does not cure the defect of Jürgenhake. The Examiner has not asserted that Hahn et al. teaches or suggests these features of claim 1, and Applicants respectfully submit that Hahn et al. does not.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____

William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156
(signing for Thomas P. Canty, Reg. No. 44, 586)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue - 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940